

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BASHIR YUSUF JAMOH	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	NO. 22-3070
	:	
JACKSON UDE	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 9th day of December 2024, upon considering defendant's motion for sanctions (DI 77), plaintiff's opposition (DI 80), and defendant's reply (DI 81), it is **ORDERED** defendant's motion for sanctions (DI 77) is **DENIED**.¹


MURPHY, J.

¹ Defendant fails to demonstrate a basis for relief. Cutting through the hyperbole and unprofessional rhetoric, defendant asks us to impose **case dispositive** sanctions on plaintiff for supposedly disobeying a recent discovery order (DI 67). But the motion lacks adequate legal or factual foundation to demand such extraordinary relief or make inflammatory allegations like "[plaintiff's counsel] is hiding those documents or . . . has destroyed or spoliated them." As plaintiff showed in his opposition, he amended his discovery responses and produced documents in compliance with our order. To go further would be to relitigate the last round of discovery motions, which we will not do.